

From: Betsy Reifsnider
Sent: Friday, March 25, 2005 5:16 PM
To: Dabbs, Paul
Cc: sevans
Subject: addendum to FOR comments

Dear Paul,

The last update on Bulletin 160 arrived in my email "in box" at 4:30 this afternoon, just after I completed FOR's comments. I reviewed "Future Water Scenarios Presented in Water Plan Update 2005" and have the following comments. I will include them in the paper copy I am also mailing you.

- o "Future Water Scenarios Presented in Water Plan Update 2005" was provided to us in the late afternoon of March 25. Reading it quickly to provide comments before today's deadline, I find that DWR sets out three scenarios - current trends, less resource intensive, and more resource intensive - without recommending to California's decision makers which scenario is preferred. As stated above, we recommend that DWR put forth a positive philosophy for public investment, one that emphasizes resource protection, cost-effectiveness, and Environmental Justice.

- o Page 4: This page was impossible to read on line.

- o Page 7: "Current Trends" and "More Resource Intensive" do not mention the effect of not meeting CALFED Ecosystem Restoration Program requirements. What happens when there is "less water available to the environment"? What happens to commercial and sports fishing industries, tourism-based economies, human health, etc? The only place we see how the environment is affected is in one bullet point in "Less Resource Intensive." In that scenario, CALFED objectives are met and fisheries improve. We recommend listing the effects of insufficient water to the environment in the "Current Trends" and "More Resource Intensive" scenarios.

Sincerely,
Betsy Reifsnider

--

1344 Vallejo Way
Sacramento, CA 95818